



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

tion"; I should have said the phrase meant "to black-jack one and sell his body for dissection". Such facts illustrate the beginnings of semantic change, and I mention the matter merely to lead up to the expression of a wish that somebody would make in this field a collection analogous to that of Mayer and Meringer.—Would the use of "govern" (136) belong to such a collection?—The condensation (146 f.) of Oertel's argument seems to me to bring out its weakness. 'A concrete fact . . . the unity of which is subjective' is a *contradictio in adjecto*. The fallacy lies in regarding 'contains no differences' and 'contains no differences that are commonly perceived as such by its users' as equivalent. The only concrete facts are the single utterances of an individual. The 'language of the individual', 'dialect', and 'language' are all abstractions, differing from one another in the quantity and the magnitude of the elements which we disregard.—The use of "automatically" (169) is unfortunate.—As for the question of linguistic politics at the end of the book I believe that the way in which the School should endeavor to improve the language is by teaching its pupils to love the true, the good, the beautiful, to think clearly, to act honestly and bravely. Accomplish that and we need not worry about the particular form their speech will take.

These differences of opinion, or of its formulation, do not, however, to my mind outweigh the merits of the book. Professor Sturtevant is a pioneer attempting a difficult and important task. He has done his work well. In my classes I shall use his book in connection with Professor Bloomfield's. If any member of the wider public seeks my advice, I shall tell him to read first Professor Sturtevant's book, and, if he wishes more, to follow it with Professor Bloomfield's. I hope that the book may be so successful that we shall soon have a second edition revised and enlarged.

Ohio State University. GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

The Seven Wonders of the Ancient World. By Edgar J. Banks. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons (1916). Pp. xi + 191. 34 illustrations. \$1.50.

This is a popular and very readable book by the author of a good volume on Bismya or The Lost City of Adab, who was Field Director of the Expedition of the Oriental Exploration Fund of the University of Chicago to Babylonia. The subject of the Seven Wonders is most interesting and yet surprisingly little has been written about them. Dr. Banks says in his Preface that he could not name the seven wonders when the editor of a monthly periodical desired an article on them, but he seems to have studied about them in encyclopedias and to have discovered a Latin dissertation and an old book dealing with them. He does not mention, however, Benjamin Ide Wheeler's excellent articles on The Seven Wonders, in The Century for 1898. Nor does he take up the history of the tradition of The Seven Wonders, which still needs investigation;

but the most pathetic thing about the book is that, while the chapters are charmingly written and show some knowledge of recent excavations, they are full of inaccuracies, especially in names, dates and measurements. A very few of these errors are indicated below.

The derrick is said to be unknown to the ancients (12). Agelados and Polygustus were the teachers of Phidias, says Dr. Banks (82). By the first is meant Ageladas and by the latter probably Polygnotus, though it is not certain that Polygnotus was Phidias's teacher. On page 84 we read, "At Athens in the year 444 B. C. began the reign of the great Pericles", and on page 86 we find, "When the downfall of Pericles was assured the enemies of Phidias plotted to rob him of his fame". "About the year 470 B. C. the great temple of Zeus was built, and thirty-six tall granite columns surrounded it", we read on page 88, but on page 89 we have the statement that Phidias fled from Athens to Olympia as the great temple of Zeus was nearing completion, and that, though a refugee, he received the commission for the statue of Zeus, but we are told that this was after the completion of the Athena Parthenos, which we know was dedicated in 438 B. C. Dr. Banks thus within a page dates the temple of Zeus about 470 B. C. and after 438 B. C. On page V he also dates the statue of Zeus 470-462, but on page 91 he implies that it was completed about 430 B. C. The idea of an opening in the roof is antiquated, and the description of the statue is very inaccurate, and the chapter as a whole has many easy assertions about the puzzling life of Phidias. The chapter on The Temple of Diana shows no genuine knowledge of the sources, and is full of errors. The theater would seat, we read, more than 50,000, and we hear (116) of the statues of the Amazons which Phidias made in competition with other artists, whereas Phidias made only one statue. The name of the architect of the Mausoleum was Pythius, not Pythis (134, 137), and it is doubtful if he sculptured the famous chariot group surmounting the tomb. Nor would archaeologists agree that above the columns extending about the four sides of the building was the wonderful frieze with which the greatest artists of the ancient world sought to perpetuate their fame (139). The excavations at the Mausoleum began in November, 1856, and not on the first day of January, 1857 (149); no mention is made of the later excavations in 1865 by Biliotti and Salzmann, or of the pieces of the Mausoleum found at Rhodes in 1876 and 1879. The chapter on The Colossus of Rhodes is also full of stupid and erroneous statements, showing that Dr. Banks has not even taken the trouble to read the literature on the subject. We have space to note but one or two errors. The large harbor embraced by two of the arms projecting from the mountains (157) is only an artificial one made by moles. Pliny's 300 talents as the price of the metal from Demetrius's engines of war are twice reduced to thirty (160, 161). The mole is too small for the Colossus, and yet we read "Where should the statue stand but on the mole in the harbor where the fleet of the

vanquished Demetrius had been anchored?" Perhaps it stood outside the canal which joined the harbors or near the modern mosque of Murad Reis. "The little harbor now filled with sand" (166) is actually frequented to-day by torpedo boats. The reconstruction of the Pharos of Alexandria given on page 177 is far inferior to that of Thiersch, which is reproduced in Dr. Banks's articles in *Art and Archaeology*, where the illustrations are better than the very inferior ones in the book, but where the text still has many inaccuracies, though improved over that in the book.

THE JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY. DAVID M. ROBINSON.

### TERENCE, PHORMIO 502-503

Phormio 502-505 run as follows:

- PH. Neque Antipho alia quom occupatus esset sollicitudine  
tum hoc esse mi obiectum malum! ANT. Quid istuc est autem, Phaedria?  
PH. O fortunatissime Antipho! ANT. Egone? PH. Quoi quod amas domist,  
neque cum huius modi umquam usus venit ut conflictares malo.

Lines 502-503 have long given editors much trouble, not because they are not translatable, but because they involve an apparent inconsistency. Phaedria is the speaker. Antipho has married his sweetheart, and taken her to his father's home, but Phaedria's love is still in the hands of the increasingly inflexible pander. Antipho's father has returned home, and the son is at his wit's end to explain the presence of his wife within the house. However, he has the consolation of being actually in possession of her. Phaedria cannot even possess his love. Thus he exclaims, 'To think that this trouble did not come to me, when Antipho was busy with another trouble'. And in the next line he cries out, 'Oh most fortunate Antipho'.

This last exclamation, editors say, is inconsistent with Antipho's troubles, but they do not stop to think that it is Phaedria who speaks in the light of his own incomparably worse misfortunes. These editors (e. g. Morgan, Cambridge, 1903; Sargeant, Cambridge, 1912) adopt an emendation of *neque* to *atque* in the first line, put forth by Wagner. These lines would then be translated, according to Morgan, "Think of all this trouble happening to me at the very time when Antipho is full of another worry of his own!" Sargeant takes unjustifiable liberty with the meaning of *alia*, translating it as "like". In spite of all this, however, the apparent incongruity still exists, and nothing is gained by tampering with a text which is above suspicion.

The latest editors of the Phormio (Sloman, Elmer, and Ashmore) have wisely returned to the original text and its traditional explanation. Elmer (Boston, 1896) has made very satisfactory use of it. His general interpretation is, "To think that this trouble, if it had to come at all, did not come at a time when Antipho was having less trouble of his own, that he might devote himself more exclusively to helping me".

The difficulty, however, may be met in another way. *Neque*, taken as equivalent to *et non*, should divide its force, the negative going with *alia*, and the connective accompanying the infinitive of exclamation (for *neque* and *nec* with the exclamatory infinitive see e. g. Phormio 230 ff., and Juno's cry in Aeneid 1.38). Such a distribution of the force of *neque* (*nec*) is not without parallels. Instances of such use of *neque* in sentences containing indirect discourse, the *et* element going with the main verb, the *non* element with the dependent infinitive, are very common; compare e. g. Phormio 113 f. But other more violent cases of division of meaning in this word occur. Thus in Curtius Rufus 9.9 Ibi diutius subsistere coactus, quia duces socordius adservati profugerant, misit, qui conquirerent alios, *nec* repertis pervicax cupido visendi Oceanum adeundi-que terminos mundi sine regionis peritis flumini ignoto caput suum totque fortissimorum virorum salutem permittere instigabat, the *et* element connects *misit* and *instigabat*, and the *non* element goes with *repertis*. A still more violent case is Ovid, Metamorphoses 10.568-569 *nec* "Sum potiunda nisi", inquit, "victa prius cursu; pedibus contendite mecum" . . . . There the *non* element of *nec* must be taken within the direct discourse.

Furthermore, in our Terentian passage, the *cum*-clause, we believe, anticipates *o fortunatissime Antipho* below. Antipho was taken up with no other trouble than that of explaining the presence of his wife at his father's house, small indeed when compared to procuring without funds a wife from a relentless pander (Stallbaum, Leipsic, 1830, suggested this interpretation, but the suggestion has been totally ignored).

Accordingly, the lines in question should be rendered, 'To think that this evil should have befallen me, when Antipho was taken up with no other trouble'. This is not at all a cry of 'misery likes company', but an exclamation of grim cynicism, very characteristic of the ancient Latin and modern Italian.

PRINCETON, N. J.

ROY J. DEFERRARI.

### Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals

#### IV

- Aberdeen University Review—Dec., Newbolt's "Qui procul hinc" [Greek Version, by J. Harrower].  
Athenaeum—September Supplement, (P. L. Warren, Plotinus. The Ethical Treatises).—October Supplement, (T. R. Glover, From Pericles to Philip).  
Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia (Madrid)—Nov. Epigrafía Romana y Griega de la Provincia de Cáceres (illustrated), Fidel Fita.  
Church Quarterly Review—Oct., (W. Leaf, Homer and History).  
Correspondant (Paris)—Oct. 25, Euripide. À propos de l'Andromaque de Mm. Silvain et Jaubert, A. Poizat.—Dec. 10, Civilisation Latine et Civilisation Moderne. I., G. De Lamarzelle.—Dec. 25, The same, II.  
Dial—Jan. 17, Greek Meets Greek, H. B. Alexander = (L. Cooper, The Greek Genius and its Influence).  
Educational Review—Jan., P. E. Legrand, The New Greek Comedy (E. D. Perry).  
Istituto Lombardo—Fasc. xiv-xv, Per la Resurrezione del Latino come Lingua Scientifica Internazionale, C. Pascal.  
Modern Philology—Dec., Vergil's Aeneid and the Irish Imrama, W. F. Thrall.  
Revista de Filología Española (Madrid)—Sept., P. G. Antolíñ, Catálogo de los Códices Latinos de la Real Biblioteca del Escorial (A. Millares Carlo).  
Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature—Dec. 8-15, Orsi, Les Fouilles de Locres, A. de Ridder [comment on Notizie degli Scavi, 14.3-5, 69-196].